



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

29, 1899, for the pacific settlement of international disputes, the task of elucidating by means of impartial and conscientious investigation the questions of fact connected with the incident which occurred during the night of October 21-22, 1904, in the North Sea (on which occasion the firing of guns on the Russian fleet caused the loss of a boat and the death of two persons belonging to a British fishing fleet, as well as damages to other boats of that fleet and injuries to the crews of some of those boats), the undersigned, being duly authorized thereto, have agreed upon the following provisions:

ARTICLE 1. — The international commission of inquiry shall be composed of five members (commissioners), of whom two shall be officers of high rank in the British and imperial Russian navies respectively. The governments of France and the United States shall each be requested to select one of their naval officers of high rank as a member of the commission. The fifth member shall be chosen by agreement between the four members above mentioned; in the event of no agreement being arrived at between the four commissioners as to the selection of the fifth member of the commission, His Imperial and Royal Majesty the Emperor of Austria and King of Hungary will be invited to select him. Each of the two high contracting parties shall likewise appoint a legal assessor to advise the commissioners and an agent officially empowered to take part in the labors of the commission.

ART. 2. — The commission shall inquire into and report on all circumstances relative to the North Sea incident, and particularly on the question as to where the responsibility lies and the degree of blame attaching to subjects of the two high contracting parties or to subjects of other countries in the event of their responsibility being established by the inquiry.

ART. 3. — The commission shall settle the details of procedure which it will follow for the purpose of accomplishing the task wherewith it has been intrusted.

ART. 4. — The two high contracting parties undertake to supply the commission, to the utmost of their ability, with all the means and facilities necessary in order to enable it to acquaint itself thoroughly with and appreciate correctly the matters in dispute.

ART. 5. — The commission shall assemble in Paris as soon as possible after the signature of this agreement.

ART. 6. — The commission shall present its report to the two high contracting parties, signed by all the members of the commission.

ART. 7. — The commission shall take all its decisions by a majority of the votes of the five commissioners.

ART. 8. — The two high contracting parties undertake each to bear on reciprocal terms the expenses of the inquiry made by it previous to the assembly of the commission, the expenses incurred by the international commission after the date of its assembly in organizing its staff and conducting the investigations which it will have to make shall be equally shared by the two governments.

In faith thereof the undersigned have signed the present agreement (declaration) and affixed their seals to it.

Done in duplicate at St Petersburg, November 25, 1904.

## Proceedings of the Thirteenth Universal Peace Congress (Continued).

At the close of Mr. Straus' address Tuesday evening, October 4, in Tremont Temple, Mr. Joseph G. Alexander of London, Secretary of the International Law Association, was introduced and said in substance:

"I am glad to be able to represent in this Congress an association which, in addition to its ordinary work, has always maintained the standard of international arbitration as a great ideal. I share in the regret that Mr. White is not here this evening, though he could not have been better replaced. It was my privilege five years ago to meet Mr. White at The Hague when I was there with a deputation of the British Society of Friends, seeking to strengthen the hands of the Conference. After visiting Baron de Staal, the president of the Conference, we called next on Andrew D. White. He received us with great courtesy and respect, and I had hoped to meet him again here.

"In the service held here Sunday afternoon you repeated the words of an old prophecy: 'And God shall judge between the nations and arbitrate for many peoples.' I do not know the source of that translation. It corresponds to a French rendering with which I am familiar, and gives the true force of the original. The position of that passage in the prophecy is remarkable. It comes just before the prophecy of the time when they shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning-hooks, and the nations shall learn war no more. It is wonderful that this ancient prophet should have put his finger, so to speak, upon the fact that in order to peace among the nations with their jarring interests, there must be an institution of judgment, of justice. What is coming to pass now, therefore, in the constitution and work of the Hague Tribunal, is the fulfilment of this prophecy of twenty-six hundred years ago.

"It is to me very striking how the Hague Conference was led to do what nobody expected from it. We who had been interested in peace congresses had been for years expressing our wish for a permanent court of arbitration. But the Hague Conference was not summoned to establish such a court. It was called to consider the question of mutual disarmament. It was only in the second circular that the subject of arbitration was introduced. To our great disappointment, the Conference arrived at no result at all on the subject of reduction of armaments. But in constituting the permanent tribunal at The Hague it achieved a marvelous success. It is not necessary here to go into the constitution of that Court. What rejoices us, friends of peace, is that we see in it the beginning of that for which we have so long pleaded, organized peace, the substitution of a regular arbitrament of justice for the cruel and unsatisfactory arbitrament of the sword. Much remains yet to be done before we realize Victor Hugo's ideal of the United States of Europe, and still more before we get Tennyson's 'federation of the world.' But this is the first step, at which we rejoice.

"A distinguished English lawyer, Mr. Cranthorpe, writing on the setting up of the Hague Tribunal, has said that machinery, though most valuable, is useless

unless motive power be put into it. The machinery of the big Atlantic steamers is of no value for crossing the ocean until you have steam in the boilers. The machinery of the Hague Court, admirable as it is, must have in it the steam of public opinion, if it is to be of real value.

"The first reference to the Hague Court was somewhat like putting water into a pump to make it go. President Roosevelt put water into the Hague Court and got it agoing. [Applause.] But something more has happened. The ten arbitration treaties signed within the last ten months specify the Hague Court as the tribunal to which disputes between these nations are to be referred. We need not be anxious, therefore, that there should be a great number of disputes in order to put the Hague Court to work. What the Court needs to support it is the continuous and persistent force of public opinion. The people of all our lands should determine that henceforth all disputes shall go to this great tribunal.

"But back of all we want a better feeling between nations, more brotherliness. What difference does it make on which side of an artificial boundary a man is born? [Applause.] If we can create a spirit of fraternity among the nations, then the Hague Court will do its work efficiently, and we shall see peace permanently and surely organized."

The next speaker was Professor Ludwig Quidde, of Munich, Germany, who spoke in German:

One of the morning speeches had spoken of the possibility of an American-German war. Whatever the "yellow" journals might do to inflame the people, such war he considered impossible. The leaders of the people did not want it. He could testify that in Germany nobody had the least wish for such a war. It would be doubly dreadful as a fratricidal war. No power in the world could force these two countries to take up arms against each other. [Applause.]

The adversaries of the peace movement made fun of it, saying that "the Boer War was the first success of the Hague Convention, and the Russo-Japanese War the second." To speak thus was to misjudge the whole movement. The friends of peace had no intention of declaring "eternal peace" to-morrow. They knew very well that it would take a long time to destroy all the old causes of war which were still working. The peace work would be one of long development.

The whole progress of civilization, Professor Quidde said, consisted in the gradual increase of the sphere of law, and a slow but steady restriction of force to even narrower limits. In the beginnings of civilization quarrels between individuals were settled by brute force. Every man able to carry arms sought right for himself by the sword. The only restriction was that it must be his right. Feud was not then a crime, it was a legal institution.

The first progress was the bringing of the petty wars of the chiefs under certain regulations, and the prohibition of them at certain times. Germany suffered from the petty wars of the feudal chieftains from the time of Charlemagne down to the time of the proclamation of the King's Peace. Feuds continued, in fact, fifty years later, but the King's Peace made them legally crimes. Individual violence was now unlawful, and the

only possibility of lawful violence remaining was war between nations. This, also, we were about to put an end to. If our ancestors had been told that a time would come when they would not be allowed to seek their right by the sword, they would have laughed, and said that it would not be possible to live under such conditions. But the world moved on, though men rode no more on mailed horses.

War between nations was passing through the same stages. Certain rules had been laid down for its conduct on land and sea, and for its restriction. And now effort was being made to abolish it entirely, as personal combat had been abolished. An important step toward this end had been taken when the Hague Convention was concluded. It was now very easy to settle any dispute by arbitration, if there was a wish to do so. The further purpose of the peace movement was to change voluntary into obligatory arbitration.

Professor Quidde expressed the fear that a good deal of our boasted civilization was like beauty, only skin deep; that the fierce instincts inherited from the past were still with us and liable to plunge us into brutal deeds. Much had been done to abolish the disposition to fight and war; this work must be continued by the friends of peace, the goal being the entire supplanting of war and its spirit by good will and arbitration.

The Chairman next introduced Dr. W. Evans Darby, Secretary of the British Peace Society, of whose address the following is a summary:

"Professor Westlake, one of our distinguished jurists, who is a member of the Hague Court, wrote me just before I left home that he hoped the Congress would consider the means of securing justice as a means to peace. Grotius' motto was '*Pax et Justitia*,' and the two must always go together between states as between men.

"How far has the establishment of the Hague Court been a step toward securing peace by justice? I do not share the opinion that nothing was done at The Hague in the direction of disarmament. The governments and the people they govern have long been deceived by the old pagan idea that to have peace you must be prepared for war. Under the influence of that idea no proposal for disarmament would be considered unless there existed some substitute for 'the arbitrament of the sword.' The Hague Conference, therefore, when it provided for the tribunal of arbitration, took the surest way to disarmament. [Applause.]

"We all remember the morning when the proposal of the Czar fell upon the world like a bolt out of the blue heavens. We had been dreaming of the possibility of the establishment of a tribunal for the administration of arbitration. We had been working also. When the Czar's Rescript came people said: 'This is a Utopian idea. Who will listen to any proposal of disarmament?' The late Archbishop of Canterbury refused to preside at a public meeting in support of the Czar's proposal, because he could not, so he wrote, waste his time on impracticable schemes.

"When the Conference met it found itself, as might have been expected, face to face with arbitration, which had only been mentioned in the Czar's second circular. The result of the Conference was a great treaty signed by the representatives of nine-tenths of the inhabitants

of the globe. Then we were told that the Conference had accomplished nothing because it had discovered no method of disarmament. But what the Conference did in establishing the permanent Court was the straight pathway to disarmament. This will appear more clearly if we notice that the course of history in regard to private war is repeating itself in the matter of international war.

"In the lower stages of society men fought personally for their rights, and the families and clans did the same. They were judges in their own cause. Later, private war was put under restrictions. Then came judgment by courts, with regulated private war still existing. Finally personal combat was made a crime, and disappeared, private disputes going regularly to the courts. The present system of justice, notwithstanding the law's delay and expense, is infinitely better than the old one of private vengeance. International or public war has passed through the same stages. First there was unrestricted fighting, then regulated warfare. Now for a hundred years or more judicial settlement by arbitration — arbitrations *ad hoc* — has gone on alongside of regulated warfare. The number of settlements by this method has been surprisingly large. In fact the method has been a part of the regular procedure in international regulations for a hundred years since the Jay treaty of 1794.

"In the Hague Court we have the permanent establishment of judicial arbitration. We have entered upon the last stage of the evolution, when the permanent international court is finally to supplant public war as the systems of civil law and courts have done away with private combat. When the old prophets, Isaiah and Micah, uttered their memorable predictions about the nations learning war no more, nothing seemed more incredible. Brutal power was then sweeping the earth carrying everything before it. To-day the nations are still learning war, never more alarmingly so, but the new institution of the permanent international court is a sure sign that the end of war is rapidly drawing near.

"You Americans, through the action of your President in bringing the Hague Court into successful operation, have done a great service to humanity."

The meeting then adjourned.

#### CHRISTIAN ENDEAVOR PEACE RALLY.

At the same hour on Tuesday evening a great Christian Endeavor Peace Rally was held in Park Street Church, which was filled to its utmost capacity. The devotional exercises were conducted by Rev. J. J. Dunlop, pastor of the Roxbury Presbyterian Church. Dr. Francis E. Clark, founder of the Christian Endeavor organization, presided. The speakers were Rev. Richard Westrope of York, England, Rev. M. J. Elliott of Watlington, England, Rev. Walter Walsh of Dundee, Scotland, Pastor Charles Wagner of Paris, and Hon. Samuel B. Capen, president of the American Board.

Dr. Clark described the founding of the International Christian Endeavor Brotherhood, in a room of the Old Bailey, London, last summer, as the most significant and inspiring event connected with the Christian Endeavor World Convention. Mr. Westrope brought out as grounds of hope the fact that the true disciples of the Prince of Peace were never so numerous as now, and further, that the social spirit which Christianity has pro-

duced is taking such wide and deep hold on the world. Mr. Elliott emphasized the intimate relation of the peace movement to Christianity, and the incompatibility of the whole spirit and practice of warfare with the spirit and teaching of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Pastor Wagner developed the thought that war is not in the big guns, the strongholds and the battleships, but in the hearts of men, and that to put an end to war, the dispositions that led to it must be rooted out of men's souls, and that children must be educated in a manner to create within them the pacific mind. Mr. Walsh pointed out to the young people that the time has gone by for the excessive admiration of soldiers and fawning upon them, and that there is a new chivalry of sacrifice for the good of others to which the youth of to-day should commit themselves. Mr. Capen dwelt upon the growing solidarity of the race, the close and intimate relations of all nations and peoples to-day, and the remarkable manner in which the business interests of the world are allying themselves with philanthropy and religion to suppress war.

WEDNESDAY MORNING, OCTOBER 5.

The second business session of the Congress was called to order Wednesday morning in Tremont Temple at 10 o'clock.

On the motion of Edwin D. Mead, it was voted to send cablegrams of greeting to Frederic Passy, Paris, Hodgson Pratt, London, Elie Ducommun, Berne, and Andrew Carnegie, Skibo Castle, Scotland.

The President, who could not remain for the forenoon, called Albert K. Smiley to the chair.

The Secretary presented an additional number of letters and telegrams of greeting from people and associations in different parts of the country and of Europe, including one from Dr. Thomas Barclay of London, which had been received through the Associated Press.

The Baroness von Suttner, who had just arrived from Europe, was then presented to the Congress and received a most cordial welcome from the audience. In a few words she presented the greetings of the Austrian and the Hungarian Peace Societies and the Academical Peace Society of the University of Vienna. She rejoiced in the fact that the peace movement, which had begun in America, was now encircling the world, though the gigantic horrors now being perpetrated in the Far East took away much of the delight and made one almost feel ashamed to be a citizen of the present world.

Rabbi J. Leonard Levi of Pittsburg was introduced and expressed to the Congress the greetings and best wishes of the Jewish people, to whom above all other peoples, he said, the cause of peace was sacred. The ideal of the prophet Isaiah, he said, had been the means of inaugurating the movement which had led to this Peace Congress. One of the greatest messages from the Good Book was that there is but one God for us all. In the human spectrum white, black, red, brown and yellow men are all necessary. War is fratricide, no matter between what races. It is a game of red and black — red with blood, black with hate. Its true character must be taught in the pulpits, the schools everywhere.

Baba Bharati, speaking for India, pleaded the cause of the Thibetans, whose country had been ruthlessly invaded. The English government, he said, had been wheedled into the thing. The English did not want it, but the

Indian government did, and had wheedled the home government into it. Speaking of the Russo-Japanese war, he pleaded for the removal of the causes of war between the East and the West. The causes, he said, were the purpose of the West to thrust its civilization and its religion upon the East. The East revered Jesus. The East did not retaliate when they were called heathens and call the Westerners heathens. The word heathen ought to be blotted out of the dictionaries. The foundations of Eastern civilization were as old as creation and could not be destroyed. The East had been the parent of all civilizations.

Dr. M. Chirug, speaking for Russia, declared that the people at large in Russia were lovers of peace. If there were any Japanese present as a member of the Congress he would be glad to extend to him the hand of greeting as a fellowman and a friend of peace.

The regular business was then taken up, and a report from the Committee on Current Questions on the Russo-Japanese war was made by Dr. Darby. The report consisted of two resolutions (given in full in our last issue), one appealing directly to the Emperors of Russia and Japan to stop the war, either by direct negotiation or by inviting the good offices of neutral powers; the other appealing to the other powers signatory of the Hague Convention to use their utmost endeavors to bring the war to a close by mediation.

These resolutions gave rise to a most interesting debate, which continued during the remainder of the session. A few objected to the adoption of the resolutions, because they felt that no immediate result would be obtained. Much the greater number thought that it was the duty of the Congress to speak clearly on the subject, whatever might or might not be the immediate effect. Those who took part in the debate were L. A. Maynard of New York, Belva A. Lockwood of Washington, E. T. Moneta of Italy, William Randal Cremer, of the British House of Commons (who gave an interesting account of an effort made from London to prevent the war), Professor Quidde of Germany, Dr. Gavin Brown Clark of England, J. G. Alexander of London, Secretary of the International Law Association, Mr. G. H. Perris of London, secretary of the Cobden Club, Mr. Pryce Jones, Member of Parliament, Mr. John Lund of the Norwegian Parliament, Dr. Magill, ex-president of Swarthmore College, Mrs. Julia Ward Howe, Dr. M. Chirug of Russia, Prof. Theodore Ruyssen of France, and Alfred H. Love of Philadelphia.

The resolutions were then adopted, as was a third one favoring the sending, if possible, of a deputation to President Roosevelt to ask him to take the initiative in trying to secure mediation by the powers to put an end to the war.

A second report from the same committee was made by Senator Houzeau de Lehaie of Belgium on the subject of the reconciliation of France and Germany over the question of Alsace-Lorraine. The committee reported that they had examined the partial report made to the Congress by the Berne Peace Bureau under instruction from the Congress of last year, and recommended that the subject be sent back to the Bureau for further consideration and report next year.

The recommendation was approved, and the session then adjourned.

On Wednesday afternoon, from 4 to 6 o'clock, a reception was given to the delegates by the Mayor of Boston at the Public Library.

#### THE INTEREST OF BUSINESS MEN IN THE CAUSE OF PEACE

On Wednesday evening a public meeting was held in Tremont Temple for the consideration of the relations of business to the movement for international peace. The meeting was called to order by Mr. Paine, President of the Congress, at 8 o'clock, and Mr. William H. Lincoln, ex-President of the Boston Chamber of Commerce, was called to the chair.

Mr. Lincoln, on taking the chair, said:

"It is incumbent on every business man to do his part in forwarding this great cause, one of the greatest causes in the world at the present time. The cause is making notable and satisfactory progress. Since the meeting of the Peace Congress in 1903, ten nations have signed arbitration treaties pledging reference to the Hague Court. The mere fact of the existence of the Court will cause many cases to be settled out of court.

"It is gratifying to us that the United States led the world in organized work for peace, three peace societies, the first in the world, being founded here in 1815. The peace congresses had their inception in Boston. America had the honor of opening the Hague Court. At the Pan-American Congress in 1901-02, all the Central and South American States asked for admission to the Hague Court. Forty nations of the two hemispheres now have no cause of war with each other. But there is still a great deal to be accomplished.

"It is quite unnecessary to attempt to portray the horrors, the barbarities of war, its degrading influences on society. The sufferings on the battlefield are equalled by the anguish and desolations at home. The enormous expenditures of money constitute a fearful drain upon the resources of the people, consuming the vitals of the nations. This waste is a serious menace to progress and prosperity. Hence financial and business interests are demanding the destruction of the war system. The imagination cannot conceive the beneficent results that would flow from the death of the monster that is gnawing the root of all prosperity.

"It is in the power of business men to put a stop to war by refusing to furnish the sinews of war. War could not be carried on without the aid of financiers who control the money markets.

"As a result of an address of Dr. Thomas Barclay before the Boston Chamber of Commerce last January, an Arbitration Committee of the Chamber was organized. This was followed by the organization of a Massachusetts International Arbitration Committee. This action has been followed in other states. Very soon a large majority of the boards of trade and chambers of commerce of the country will be united in the demand for arbitration treaties between this and other countries.

"Boston is a city of 'isms,' but not in the bad sense. It is a city of patriotism, of high and noble idealism. It stands for what is true and right and just. That is why the peace movement had its origin here. The merchants of Boston have a record of which they may well be proud. Boston has occupied a high position in the commerce of the world. Boston business men know that the mission of

commerce is to cultivate friendly relations with all nations, to promote the welfare and happiness of mankind. All business interests are affected by even the mere apprehension of war. Financial panics and revulsions of business are thereby brought about, causing the loss of hundreds of millions. Therefore it behooves the business interests of this and of all countries to insist that the governments shall enter into arbitration treaties and proceed to a gradual disarmament." [Applause.]

Hon. John Lund of the Norwegian Parliament was the next speaker. He said:

"No array of proofs are necessary to show that commerce demands peace. Undisturbed trade routes and means of communication are as necessary to the health of nations as an uninterrupted blood circulation to that of the body. A brief disturbance often causes the loss of many millions to the people of a country.

"The world of trade looked on our peace efforts skeptically for awhile, but the veil has fallen from its eyes. It is now out and out friendly to the movement. Business men are among the most active in trying to secure treaties and guarantees for the better protection of the course of trade.

"On my recent journey through your country, as a member of the Interparliamentary Union, I was dumb with admiration at the extent and beauty of the achievements of your American spirit and energy. But I felt that it would be the most heinous sin if war were to be permitted to lay its ravaging hand upon the material happiness and well being which I witnessed.

"The great economic damages which war occasions are not so easily grasped as the number of deaths and mutilations, but they are terrible enough. Every wasted shilling is so much deducted from the economic basis on which a community rests. The land which will carry on a war must be prepared to see its stocks sink in value. This often affects millions of those who have invested their hard won savings in the stocks. The day of the outbreak of war between Russia and Japan, the value of the Russian Loan stocks fell in France half a billion francs.

"If we look at the sums which go to the carrying on of wars, we find still more enormous amounts gone up in smoke. The Crimean war has been computed to have cost three hundred and forty million pounds sterling, the Italian war sixty, the Austro-Prussian war sixty-six, the Franco-German war five hundred, the Russo-Turkish war two hundred, the British war against the Zulus and Afghans thirty. The Boer war cost the British taxpayers not less than two hundred and thirty million. Mr. Hanotaux estimates that the Franco-German war cost France alone six hundred million pounds sterling.

"What sums the present war is swallowing daily! How much of the millions put into the Russian and Japanese fleets will be left when the war ends? In the war with China every Japanese soldier cost the government sixteen shillings per day. The present war will cost Japan not less than seven million pounds per month.

"War indemnities are also enormous. Turkey had to hand over to Russia forty-five million pounds, France to Germany two hundred million, Austria to Prussia three million, Greece to Turkey four million.

"To provide such enormous sums requires an incalculable amount of work by the non-fighters.

"Europe has enjoyed peace for a generation, but the 'Armed Peace' has been maintained at frightful cost. This absurd procedure might be satisfactory enough, if it offered reasonable guarantees against war. But it gives no absolute assurance of peace. The small powers, however much they may arm, are at the mercy of the great. The total state expenditure on the European armies in 1903 was two hundred and sixty million pounds. To this must be added two hundred and twenty million pounds, the value of the working power of more than four million men which goes to waste. The system costs Europe, all told, not less than seven pounds ten shillings per family. What a blessed work in the service of peace all these mighty sums might provide for millions of men!

"Whether the ideal of perpetual peace can ever be attained it would be idle to attempt to discuss. Our campaign is against an evil which has the prescriptive right of thousands of years to support it. We must be satisfied if we see the cause gradually gaining ground. It is much if by the instrumentality of negotiation and arbitration the horrors of a single war only can be prevented.

"American men of business have certainly acquired the art of making money. Let us hope that they will master the still greater art of making peace. Millions devoted to the service of peace will be of greater importance to them than the millions which they are compelled to contribute every year to the service of war."

Edward Atkinson of Boston was next introduced, and said in substance:

"The interdependence of nations is becoming the rule. This interdependence makes for peace and plenty. The predatory system of conquest and colonization has about ended. This system has imposed excessive cost without adequate return. Even in Germany a stern resistance is being developed against the military class. When the masses there are a little more developed in intelligence, they will suppress the military and privileged classes.

"Commerce is becoming the paramount power in the civilized world. By the united action of the chambers of commerce in Great Britain, France and Italy these countries have been compelled to enact treaties of arbitration by which the previous causes of war will, for the most part, be sent to the courts for judicial decision.

"There is one other great movement by which the peace of the world may be practically assured. It may at first seem visionary, but it is not. In the last century it became necessary to establish neutral zones on land and sea. Belgium and Switzerland were neutralized. The Suez Canal has been neutralized. But the most conspicuous example of neutralization is that of the Great Lakes on our Northern border. After the War of 1812 when the British vessels on the lakes were nearly all destroyed and those of this country badly shattered, the United States began to lay down the keels of a new navy, and England was preparing to follow.

"When John Quincy Adams was sent in 1816 as Minister to England, he proposed to the British government that 'in order to avoid collision and to save expense' neither nation should build or maintain vessels of war on the Great Lakes. The next year, when he became Secretary of War, a simple agreement was entered into to this effect, and since 1817 no war vessels have been upon these lakes.

"Now, the greatest water ways of commerce are upon the Atlantic Ocean. These ways are well defined. They are marked on all the charts. Why not, 'in order to avoid collision and to save expense' neutralize these ferry ways? Why not enter upon treaties defining neutral zones and uniting for the maintenance of their neutrality? This proposition is not half so visionary as it would have been a few years ago to propose the treaties of arbitration now existing. It needs only the common sense and sagacity and force of the business men of different countries to compel the neutralization of these highways of the sea. It is time for the business men to assert their power and demand in the name of common sense, common right and common wealth, that this thing be done and that the curse of war cease."

Mr. Georg Arnhold, of the banking house of Arnhold & Co., Dresden, was the next speaker. His remarks in German were interpreted by Dr. Urban of Harvard University. He was surprised at the great progress of the peace movement in the United States as compared with Germany. It was realized in Germany that war was a dreadful thing, but owing to political and economic conditions the movement for its suppression was slow.

The German Emperor, he said, was a friend of peace, though of course of "the armed peace." He quoted some words of the Emperor protesting against being taken for a soldier, especially a soldier who seeks bloody laurels.

The peace movement had, however, made progress in Germany. The German Peace Society, though young, now had about twelve hundred members. The members of the universities had been the leaders in this as in other movements. The business men and the working men had also done their share. This he considered a favorable sign for the peace movement. He hoped that the manufacturers and the large land owners might also soon be reached by the economical and financial considerations, and convinced that it would be to their great loss if the peace movement failed.

Mr. George Foster Peabody of New York, who was next called upon, said:

"The peace we believe in is something that depends upon our recognition of that in man and woman that is to be revered. People should think more of themselves than to try to force on others what they would not have forced upon themselves. We shall not make much progress in this cause unless we consider it from this point of view. Modern business methods exhibit this principle in active progress. Even among the so-called speculative interests the principle of arbitration has been developed to a large extent. Modern business tries to economize expense and waste in every direction. In this direction the employment of arbitration has been most successful.

"The great fundamental business interests of the country are of course apart from the speculative. But in these also the same principle of avoiding waste and friction prevails.

"But the American business men are, after all, only representative, in our democracy, of the great multitude of the people. The business man simply makes transfers economically from the producer to the consumer, and all are consumers.

"It is great cause of rejoicing that here in Boston there

are to-night three great gatherings, met in the same interests, — a gathering of workmen, a great gathering of women, and this meeting of business men.

"I believe all that Mr. Atkinson has been saying to-night as to the development of our conviction that the peace for which we stand is an active principle. We ought to take time to consider what it is that we believe in. Men frequently say that they are peace men but that wars must sometimes be. We should not applaud the men who say, 'Yes, we must have peace,' and do what they can to build up armies and navies: men who praise peace but never work for it as an active principle, the respect, that is, that we owe to other men and women. If we follow that principle we are bound to try to prevent friction between nations. The Peace Society will, I believe, gain a larger number of members when it has the courage to drop from its list the men who talk for peace but work for war."

Mr. A. B. Farquhar, Vice-President of the National Association of Manufacturers, was the next speaker. He declared that the Association which he represented, believed to be the greatest business organization in the world, was already committed to the cause of arbitration and peace. It is of peculiar interest to manufacturers to have pacific methods substituted for warfare in the relations of nations. Their prosperity or adversity as a rule depends on the prosperity or adversity of their customers, the great public. Whatever makes their customers less able to spend, causes them to suffer. Wherever there is waste there is want, and want cuts down demand. The thoughtful business man knows therefore that there is nothing more desirable than to replace hostilities by peaceful methods of settling misunderstandings.

The opposition relies on sneers, not arguments. They pay more attention to us than to our arguments. No one whose opinion is worth noticing fails to acknowledge the superiority of arbitration to arms. But many do nothing to establish the better method, fearing that somebody else will refuse to follow it. If there is a call to any people on earth to work for universal arbitration, that call is to us as Americans. The fact that this country has already played a conspicuous part in international arbitrations is no reason for resting on our oars. This is the very land best fitted to stand in the vanguard of the movement, as its power is matchless, its resources inexhaustible. The country that has evolved our Supreme Court ought to lead and not to follow.

Arbitration, we may be sure, will never become the universally accepted solution of international questions while the nations are showing by their daily conduct that they are looking beyond it to something else as the final resort. The inseparable accompaniment of arbitration is disarmament. Huge armies, frowning fortifications, mammoth war-vessels would speedily be rendered obsolete by a genuine trust in arbitration as a reasonable method.

From a business point of view a worse investment than modern war-ships would be hard to find. After what the last few months have shown as to the ease with which they can be snuffed out, the folly of throwing away millions of dollars on such clumsy toys should not need to be proved.

But the worst of these war preparations is not their cost, nor even their worthlessness; it is the evidence



they give that our protestations of peaceful disposition are not to be taken at their face value. What effect will they have on the smaller nations which occupy our continent with us, against whom we have no need to defend ourselves?

The Arbitration Conference at Washington did not, however, go so far as to ask for a reduction of armaments. It confined itself to asking for a few treaties under which cases of disagreement should be referred normally to the Hague Court. That was very little to ask. We should not cease from our efforts until this modest demand is granted. This step taken, our further progress will naturally be determined by the result.

The last speaker of the evening was Mr. Frederick H. Jackson, President of the Providence Chamber of Commerce. Our age, he said, is the age of practicalities, as others have been the ages of chivalry or of art. The audience here gathered helps us to realize this. We have here commercial organizations taking part in the deliberations of an international Peace Congress, greed striking hands with charity. Nothing could be more natural than the union of the men of peace with the men of trade. All branches of business, manufacturing, commerce, agriculture, banking, should be and are interested in peace and arbitration. All of these interests require for their stability, growth and perpetuity the assurance of peace among the nations — peace for the sake of the proper development of trade relations throughout the whole world.

The world has given hardly passing attention to those who have preached the doctrine of peace, the doctrine announced by the Master of all, the Prince of Peace. From then till now wars and tumults, hatred and strife have reigned, even among His professed followers. Now when we are apt to think that materialism is enthroned, that man's ethical nature is being suppressed, we are brought face to face with the fact that never before has been so imminent the consummation of the angelic proclamation. The Conference at Lake Mohonk last spring was an inspiring revelation of the manner in which the directors of finance, manufacturers, men of commerce are uniting with statesmen and philanthropists to accomplish the ends for which this Congress has been convened.

The statistics which show the tremendous drain caused by war are familiar to all; so are its evil effects upon the mechanic and the laborer, the artisan and the farmer. Why, then, has the business world been so slow to recognize in the advocates of arbitration its best friends and allies? God be praised, our eyes are being opened. We have been blind and stupid. The dreamers have looked forward to the reign of peace on earth. They have proclaimed their doctrine to uninterested hearers. It is not so now. Hard-headed business men have come to see that war is the greatest enemy of industry, trade and commerce. So it comes about that boards of trade and chambers of commerce are joining in the councils of peace, and coöperating in the promotion of arbitration among the nations, that they may help hasten the day when the brotherhood of man shall not be a far-off vision, but a consummate fact.

The meeting then adjourned.

#### WOMEN'S MEETING IN PARK STREET CHURCH.

At the same time that the Business Men's Meeting was going on in Tremont Temple a great woman's meeting was in progress in Park Street Church, at which the relations of women to the peace cause were considered. Mrs. Lucia Ames Mead presided, and the speakers were Mrs. W. P. Byles of Manchester, England, Miss Jane Addams of Chicago, Miss A. M. Dunhill of India, Miss Sophia Sturge of Birmingham, England, Dr. Yamei Kin of China, Mrs. Julia Ward Howe, Miss Wilhelmina Sheriff Bain of New Zealand, and the Baroness von Suttner of Austria.

Mrs. Mead in opening the meeting emphasized the necessity of women avoiding sentimentalism and of giving themselves to definite practical work. Mrs. Byles elaborated and emphasized in a most interesting address the thought that what we want among the nations, as among individuals, is what the theologians aptly call "a change of heart." "We have to create a land where violence shall never more be heard, where vile principles shall no more be called noble, where the worker of mischief shall be no longer held worthy." Miss Addams, after calling attention to three kinds of peace advocates of the past,—those who had appealed to the sense of righteousness, those who had appealed to pity, and those who had invoked the principle of prudence,—expressed her feeling that peace work should be done in an active and constructive way, in harmony with the principles of true democracy, of self-government, in a brave and heroic way along the lines of moral adventure, of self-surrender and the service of others.

Miss Dunhill portrayed vividly the effects of the seventy thousand British soldiers in India on the population of the country—three hundred millions; on the women and men of the country, in the increase of licentiousness and drink. Miss Sophia Sturge, in a paper read by Dr. Darby, advocated as a part of the constructive peace work to be done the erection in every prominent city of a hall of peace, to be used by the people for meetings and work along peace lines. Dr. Yamei Kin, the eloquent and cultivated Chinese lady physician now in this country, spoke most briefly of the necessity of the Occident and the Orient joining hands across the seas, to weave a chain of love that shall girdle the world.

Mrs. Julia Ward Howe told briefly the story of her effort at the close of the Franco-Prussian war, including a lengthy tour in Europe, to arouse the women of the civilized world to interest themselves to try to do away with war, and of the indifference which she found at that time among women, because of their ignorance of and non-participation in the public affairs of the world. Miss W. Sheriff Bain told the story of the wars among the natives of New Zealand, of the wars between them and the British settlers, and of the manner in which the South African war had affected the country for ill. The National Council of Women of New Zealand which she represented had from its inception stood for peace.

The Baroness von Suttner, who was given an enthusiastic reception, after giving her impressions of the greatness of the peace movement in America, discussed the reasons why women do not join the peace movement in greater numbers, and set forth the power which women have in the training of children and in the exercise of



their peculiar characteristics to banish war ultimately from the earth.

After the reading of a letter from Mrs. May Wright Sewall of Indianapolis, who was to have presided, but was unavoidably kept away, the meeting adjourned.

In Faneuil Hall, on Wednesday evening, a workingmen's public mass meeting was held, which was presided over by George E. McNeil of Boston. The speakers were Samuel Gompers, President of the American Federation of Labor, Pete Curran, representative to the Peace Congress of the General Federation of English Trades Unions, Henri La Fontaine, Socialist member of the Belgium Senate, Herbert Burroughs, representing the Social Democratic Federation, and Claude Gignoux, representing the Copartnership Societies of France.

Mr. Gompers said that the trades unionists and the men and women of labor are devoted to the establishment of peace, because it is they who have to bear the burdens of war and militarism. But peace, to mean anything, must be founded upon the principles of justice and right. It makes the heart sad to think that in this year of grace we are still confronted with wars and more wars that may yet come. War, whatever you call it, is international murder. The greatest element that will make for its abolition will be the organized forces of labor acting internationally.

Pete Curran spoke of the earnest desire of the nearly two million organized workmen in Great Britain that international peace should be established, because they were frequently the victims of war. War he considered more an industrial than even a commercial question. He thought that the net gain to the United States taxpayers of the annexation of the Philippines was about the same as that to Great Britain of the annexation of the Boer republic, that is, increased and useless burdens.

Senator La Fontaine gave a description of the political conditions in Belgium, and Mr. Burroughs urged workmen to use every sane method to bring about industrial peace, which in its turn would greatly aid in the establishment of international peace. Mr. Claude Gignoux, speaking in French, developed the thought that neither the victor nor the vanquished gained anything from war.

Mr. McNeil introduced some resolutions, which were adopted by a rising vote, declaring in substance that trade-unionism makes for peace, that justice and equity to the workers would naturally tend to abolish the causes of war, and making, in the name of organized labor, a protest against war.

Arbitration held at Washington in January last and in April, 1896, Mr. Foster has had wide knowledge of the subject in his long diplomatic career, and no public man has a completer understanding than he of the spirit, the purposes and the already large success of the movement to substitute arbitration for force in the adjustment of controversies between nations.

In his treatment of the subject he first gives a brief — all too brief — historical review of the movement which led up to the Hague Conference; then he devotes some pages to the calling, the work and the importance of the Conference. In the third chapter he discusses disarmament as it was considered by the Hague Conference, quoting from the speeches made by some of the leading delegates. Mr. Foster is strongly in favor of an international agreement for the restriction of armaments, and feels that our government ought to keep itself in a position to respond without embarrassment to a call in this direction.

A full chapter is devoted to the Arbitration Convention, "the crowning work of the Hague Conference," another to the constitution and work of the Permanent Court, for which that Convention provided, and still another to some suggested modifications of the Court.

After a brief discussion of special and joint commissions, which he considers to have still a good deal of value alongside of the Hague Court, Mr. Foster in his "Conclusion" expresses his firm belief that the Hague Court, though imperfect, is a great and highly valuable instrument toward the preservation of peace, and he advises the friends of universal peace to make it their policy "to perfect that instrument, and to make the Hague Court popular with the nations as an effective means of adjusting international differences."

In an Appendix the text of the Hague Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes is given; so is that of the Anglo-French treaty of October 14, 1903, that of the Netherlands-Denmark treaty of February 12, 1904, and an extract from the Spanish-Mexican treaty of 1902. There is also included in the Appendix the history-making resolution adopted by the Interparliamentary Conference at St. Louis on the 13th of September, this year, and the speech of the Hon. Theodore E. Burton on the naval appropriation bill in the National House of Representatives on the 22d of February last.

The book will be a most useful and helpful concise manual of the arbitration movement to all those who desire to get, without going deeply into details, a comprehensive view of the subject.

## New Books.

ARBITRATION AND THE HAGUE COURT. By John W. Foster. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. Price \$1.00 net.

Hon. John W. Foster has just rendered an important service to the cause of international arbitration and peace by the publication, through Houghton, Mifflin & Co. of Boston, of a monograph on "Arbitration and the Hague Court." This work was prepared at the suggestion and invitation of the Mohonk Arbitration Conference over which Mr. Foster presided for two years. Besides his connection with this and the National Conferences on

## Auxiliaries of the American Peace Society.

THE CHICAGO PEACE SOCIETY,  
175 Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.  
H. W. Thomas, D. D., President.  
Mrs. E. A. W. Hoswell, Secretary.

THE MINNESOTA PEACE SOCIETY,  
Minneapolis, Minn.  
R. J. Mendenhall, President.  
Miss A. B. Albertson, Secretary.

THE KANSAS STATE PEACE SOCIETY,  
Wichita, Kansas.  
George W. Hoss, LL. D., President.  
J. M. Naylor, Secretary.